



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,084	02/14/2001	Tadashi Ohashi	1341.1080 (JDH)	9826

21171 7590 01/11/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

LEE, SEUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,084

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Seung H Lee

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2001 and 30 October 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the response filed on 18 October 2001 and 30 October 2001, which has been entered in the file.

Drawings

2. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 18 October 2001 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cahill et al. (US 5,940,844).

Re claim 1: a document review apparatus comprising:

a plurality of document review apparatus (7),

a communication or network unit (2) connected to a network for performing communication with other devices;

a memory unit (see claim 13);

a determination unit which determines, based on information received from the communication unit, whether the information is information holding a review result of a reviewed form to be reviewed (see col. 53, line 31 - 44);

Art Unit: 2876

a storing control unit which stores information, which has been determined by the determination unit to be information holding a review of a reviewed form, as review result information in the memory unit (see 1208; col. 25, line 34 - 65);

a creating unit which creates a single review result information based on the review result information when a predetermined number of review information have been stored in the memory unit (see 1214; col. 34, lines 10-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill et al. in view of Mahmood (US 5,091,727).

In addition to the teachings of Cahill as discussed above, he also teaches the document review apparatus includes a first memory (1206), a second memory unit (1214), a display unit (701A), an input unit (701C), and a display unit display a graph (see col. 47, lines 7 - 23), and the programmed processor to store a document, to transmit the document to users for reviewing the document via a network (see Fig. 5 and 5I; col. 15, lines 20-66).

However, Cahill fails to teach or fairly suggest that the document review system creates and updates the statistical data.

Mahmood teaches a management system generates the statistical data (see col. 6, lines 23 - 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Mahmood to the teachings of Cahill in order to create the easier reading/comparing data format to present the statistical data for inventory, maintenance, and marketing purposes, etc. Moreover, such modification would provide efficiently means for managing the document review system by analyzing the peak time usage in order to provide a better service to the customers, etc. Furthermore, the Cahill/Mahmood particularly fails to teach that the document review system includes the first and second memory and the modified the information updating function. However, it is notoriously old and well known in the art that the document review system includes the memories and updating the modified information onto the memory or physical disks in order to store important data/information on the separate memory/disk to prevent others (i.e., an unauthorized individuals) from accessing that data/information, and therefore an obvious expedient.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill as modified by Mahmood as discussed as in the claim 2, and further in view of Linstead et al. (US 5,548,753).

The teachings of Cahill/Mahmood have been discussed above.

In addition to the teachings of Cahill/Mahmood as discussed in the claim 2, Cahill also teaches the document review system includes the transmission unit to transmit the information (see col. 44, line 24 - col. 45, line 9).

However, Cahill/Mahmood fails to teach or fairly suggest that the document review system include a notification unit to notify to the plurality of reviewers.

Linstead teaches an automatic notification of the occurrence of events to the users (i.e., an automatic electronic mailing system) (see col. 2, lines 42 - 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the automatic mail system as taught by Linstead to the teachings of the Cahill/Mahmood in order to provide the easier notification of the upcoming event and/or distributing of the any information to a plurality of users who are interested. Moreover, such modification would reduce a personnel from traveling to each and every user/region to notify the upcoming events/information, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 18 October 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that *the 'check' of Cahill cannot be the 'document' of the invention and the Cahill does not teach the "creating unit" (see page 4, line 5+)*, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, wherein the Examiner consider the 'check' as the document in which can be reviewed and verified at the determination unit, and the creating unit to create the check image into the word processing template as discussed in paragraph 4 above.

In response to the applicant's argument that *there is no motivation to combine the technology for checking check and the technology for parking cars (see page 4, line*

25+), the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, wherein the Examiner simply provide the evidence of the *management system for generating and updating the statistical data* for maintenance, inventory, and/or marketing purpose as discussed in paragraph 6 above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure;

Vajk et al. [US 5,265,033] discloses an electronic mail system,

Knowles et al. [US 5,869,819] discloses an internet-based system,

Day [EP 0 921 486 A2] discloses a network-based document review tool.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Seung H. Lee** whose telephone number is (703) 308-


5894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax-phone number for this group is (703) 308-5841 or (703) 308-7722.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.lee@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


Seung H. Lee
Art Unit 2876
January 2, 2002


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800